

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

|                        |                            |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| David Bach,            | ) C/A No. 4:14-790-MGL-TER |
|                        | )                          |
| Plaintiff,             | )                          |
|                        | )                          |
| vs.                    | )REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION |
|                        | )                          |
| Kaymani West, and      | )                          |
| Case Manager, Meredith | )                          |
|                        | )                          |
| Defendants.            | )                          |
|                        | )                          |

---

This is a civil action filed by a pro se litigant appearing in forma pauperis. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1), and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(e), this magistrate judge is authorized to review all pretrial matters in such pro se cases and to submit findings and recommendations to the District Court.

**BACKGROUND**

Plaintiff brings this claim against Defendant West, a United States Magistrate Judge assigned to another case brought by Plaintiff in December 2013.<sup>1</sup>

**INITIAL REVIEW**

Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review has been made of the pro se Complaint pursuant to the procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915. The review has been

---

<sup>1</sup>*See Bach v. United States Government*, Civil Action No. 4:13-cv-3503-MGL. In 13-3503, Plaintiff alleges a governmental agency (“they claim they are the CIA”) is disrupting his life by placing “2 way microchip megaphones; very small speakers somewhere and ‘everywhere’ I go.” *Id.* at ECF No. 1. Plaintiff also has pending *Bach v. South Carolina Government, et al.*, Civil Action No. 4:14-cv-0074-MGL. There, Plaintiff names the South Carolina Government and a public defender as defendants and alleges “[e]verywhere I go everytime I am in certain places they are siting [sic] around the area waiting and then following me in any type of car they know I might leave the area in.” *Id.* at ECF No. 1.

conducted in light of the following precedents: *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324-25 (1989); *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97 (1976); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147 (4th Cir. 1978).

The Complaint in this case was filed under 28 U.S.C. § 1915, which permits an indigent litigant to commence an action in federal court without prepaying the administrative costs of proceeding with the lawsuit. To protect against possible abuses of this privilege, the statute allows a district court to dismiss the case upon a finding that the action “fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted” or is “frivolous or malicious.” 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(2)(B)(I), (ii). Hence, under 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(2)(B), a claim based on a meritless legal theory may be dismissed *sua sponte*. *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989).

This court is required to liberally construe pro se pleadings, *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. at 97, holding them to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys, *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 5 (1980). The mandated liberal construction afforded pro se pleadings means that if the court can reasonably read the pleadings to state a valid claim on which the plaintiff could prevail, it should do so, but a district court may not rewrite a pleading to “conjure up questions never squarely presented” to the court. *Beaudett v. City of Hampton*, 775 F.2d 1274, 1278 (4th Cir. 1985). The requirement of liberal construction does not mean that the court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts which set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. *Weller v. Dep’t of Soc. Servs.*, 901 F.2d 387 (4th Cir. 1990). Even under this less stringent standard, however, the pro se Complaint in this case is subject to summary dismissal.

## **DISCUSSION**

Initially, to the extent Plaintiff complains that there has been a delay in processing his case,

Plaintiff's Complaint should be summarily dismissed without service on Defendants because the claim he seeks to raise is moot since the initial review of Civil Action No. 13-3503 is complete. A case becomes moot "when the issues presented are no longer "live" or the parties lack a legally cognizable interest in the outcome." *Powell v. McCormack*, 395 U.S. 486, 496 (1969). A change in factual circumstances can moot a case during litigation, such as when the plaintiff receives the relief sought in his or her claim, *Simmons v. United Mortg. & Loan Inv., LLC*, 634 F.3d 754, 763 (4th Cir. 2011), or when an event occurs that makes it impossible for the court to grant any effectual relief to the plaintiff, *Church of Scientology v. United States*, 506 U.S. 9, 12 (1992).

Moreover, even if this case were not moot, both Defendants are immune from a lawsuit such as this, which is based on both Defendants' performance of their official, court-related duties. Judge West is entitled to judicial immunity from Plaintiff's implied assertions that the initial review in his two previously cases took too long. As the Fourth Circuit has stated relevant to the reasons for the doctrine of absolute immunity for judges:

The absolute immunity from suit for alleged deprivation of rights enjoyed by judges is matchless in its protection of judicial power. It shields judges even against allegations of malice or corruption. . . . The rules is tolerated, not because corrupt or malicious judges should be immune from suit, but only because it is recognized that judicial officers in whom discretion is entrusted must be able to exercise discretion vigorously and effectively, without apprehension that they will be subjected to burdensome and vexatious litigation.

*McCray v. Maryland*, 456 F.2d 1, 3 (4th Cir. 1972)(citations omitted), overruled on other grounds, *Pink v. Lester*, 52 F.3d 73, 77 (4th Cir. 1995).

The doctrine of absolute immunity for acts taken by a judge in connection with her judicial authority and responsibility is well established and widely recognized. See *Mireles v. Waco*, 502 U.S. 9, 11-12 (1991)(judges are immune from civil suit for actions taken in their judicial capacity, unless

“taken in the complete absence of all jurisdiction.”); *Stump v. Sparkman*, 435 U.S. 349, 359 (1978)(“A judge is absolutely immune from liability for his judicial acts even if his exercise of authority is flawed by the commission of grave procedural errors.”); *Pressly v. Gregory*, 831 F.2d 514, 517 (4th Cir. 1987)(a suit by South Carolina inmate against two Virginia magistrates); *Chu v. Griffith*, 771 F.2d 79, 81 (4th Cir. 1985)(“It has long been settled that a judge is absolutely immune from a claim for damages arising out of his judicial actions.”); *see also Siegert v. Gilley*, 500 U.S. 226 (1991)(immunity presents a threshold question which should be resolved before discovery is even allowed); *Burns v. Reed*, 500 U.S. 478 (1991)(safeguards built into the judicial system tend to reduce the need for private damages actions as a means of controlling unconstitutional conduct); *Mitchell v. Forsyth*, 472 U.S. 511, 526 (1985)(absolute immunity “is an immunity from suit rather than a mere defense to liability”).

Furthermore, to the extent that Plaintiff’s Complaint could be liberally construed as seeking injunctive relief against Magistrate Judge West, such claim is barred by 42 U.S.C. § 1984, which states in pertinent part,

Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress, *except that in any action brought against a judicial officer for an act or omission taken in such officer's judicial capacity, injunctive relief shall not be granted unless a declaratory decree was violated or declaratory relief was unavailable.*

*Id.* (emphasis added). Since there is no declaratory decree involved and no request for or basis shown for entry of a declaratory judgment in this case, any claim for injunctive relief against this judicial officer is statutorily barred. *Catanzaro v. Cottone*, 228 Fed. Appx. 164 (3d Cir. April 5, 2007);

*Esensoy v. McMillan*, No. 06-12580, 2007 WL 257342 (11th Cir. Jan 31 ,2007).

Furthermore, to the extent that Plaintiff's Complaint could be construed as one seeking relief from "Case manager, Meredith" based on the information she provided to him in his phone calls, his pleading is barred by the doctrine of quasi-judicial immunity. The doctrine of absolute quasi-judicial immunity has been adopted and made applicable to court support personnel such as Defendant Meredith because of "the 'danger that disappointed litigants, blocked by the doctrine of absolute immunity from suing the judge directly, will vent their wrath on clerks, court reporters, and other judicial adjuncts[.]'" *Kincaid v. Vail*, 969 F.2d 594, 601 (7th Cir. 1992)(quoting *Scruggs v. Moellering*, 870 F.2d 376, 377 (7th Cir. 1989)); see also *Ashbrook v. Hoffman*, 617 F.2d 474, 476 (7th Cir. 1980)(collecting cases on immunity of court support personnel).

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Accordingly, it is recommended that the District Court dismiss the Complaint in this case *without prejudice*. See *United Mine Workers v. Gibbs*, 383 U.S. 715 (1966); see also *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. at 324-25.

Plaintiff's attention is directed to the important notice on the next page.

s/Thomas E. Rogers, III

Thomas E. Rogers, III  
United States Magistrate Judge

April 2, 2014  
Florence, South Carolina

**Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation**

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Specific written objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a), (d). Filing by mail pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

Robin L. Blume, Clerk  
United States District Court  
Post Office Box 2317  
Florence, South Carolina 29503

**Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation.** 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).